

State. In fact, the top three recipient States, California, New Jersey and Oregon today received more than half of the funds in the program during that period.

In fiscal year 1998, the President's budget for new starts looks much the same. Of the \$634 million proposed for the program, California is to receive almost one-third of the total funding. New Jersey would get 13 percent and Oregon would get 10 percent. Again, in fiscal year 1998, these three States account for more than half of the total amount requested of the new start program.

For those of you considering light and heavy rail projects in your areas any time in the near future, let me just say this, under the current system, there are no funds available.

In addition, one has to wonder whether some transit capital grants are being spent wisely today. The Congressional Budget Office looked at the cost effectiveness of various forms of public transportation assistance. Using Department of Transportation data to compute the total annualized cost per passenger-mile of these different forms of transit, CBO concluded that ordinary buses average 35 cents per passenger-mile; commuter rail averaged 65 cents per passenger-mile; heavy rail at \$1.40 per passenger-mile; and light rail at \$3.40 per passenger-mile, nearly a tenfold increase over buses. Yet what kind of transit have cities and other local governments been rushing to build with their Federal grants?

LIGHT RAIL

Some transit advocates claim that only light rail can attract suburban commuters and stop the declining use of transit by the middle class. But almost every city that has built either light or heavy rail in the past 25 years has a smaller share of commuting by transit in 1990 than they did 10 years earlier.

This is true in Portland, San Francisco and even here in Washington, DC. In fact, the only major city that has witnessed growth in mass transit's share over the last decade has been Houston, TX, and they are building busways in Houston, not a rail system.

This brings me to my final point, which is really a call to action. What do we need to do? What can we do to develop a comprehensive coherent public transportation program which responsibly meets critical public transportation needs in a manner consistent with the reality of constrained resources? I do not claim to have the answer. But I do know this. The Federal Government is already overcommitted on transit spending, while new requests for funding, many of which would certainly meet identified needs, pour in, when large increases in spending for public transportation are not likely and when important programmatic changes are anticipated during reauthorization of ISTEA.

Those of us who care about support of public transportation must be able to

offer alternatives to the current methods of doing public transportation business. I challenge my colleagues to talk with transit managers, urban planners, as well as State and local officials to consider a number of questions, including the following:

First, does the current new starts program structure encourage metropolitan areas to build fixed-guideway systems rather than an alternative that may be more appropriate but less likely to obtain Federal funding.

Second, does the current system of providing Federal funds specifically for fixed-guideway, new start systems induce metropolitan areas to pursue more costly, less flexible systems compared to flexible route transit systems, such as buses, which can use rights-of-way that are shared by other vehicles?

Third, should the current program be changed to provide more flexibility to State and local government and transit authorities to enable them to be more responsive to the needs of their particular communities?

Fourth, does the current funding formula, 80 Federal/20 local match, have the effect of gold plating projects or providing incentive to pursue projects that transit districts and municipalities otherwise would not because of local financial limitations.

Fifth, should we continue to fund projects in the very early stages of engineering and major investment studies, the cost of which can and perhaps should be paid from State and local funds to indicate strong local support, or limit appropriations to only those projects in their final design and construction?

Sixth, should the current program be modified to provide priority funding or other preferences to projects supported by a greater local match?

Seventh, should transit capital assistance be allocated to the States and localities in a way that mirrors Federal aid highway assistance to guarantee States a minimum return on the taxes they send to Washington?

Eighth, what level of Federal funding should be made available for public transportation, and what should the source of this funding be?

One thing is certain, public transportation is an integral part of the Nation's transportation network and a vital life link for many segments of our population. As such, there must be a continuing, strong Federal role in transit. Local transit systems are the beginning and ending point for inner city transportation and are therefore very much a part of our national transportation network. And road users should help pay for transit programs in some circumstances since they benefit from them. As public transportation reduces the number of automobiles on the road, it therefore reduces congestion on roads and bridges.

Beyond this, however, our transit programs and policies must be updated. Budgetary constraints coupled with ISTEA reauthorizations demand that

we develop new ways of dealing with public transportation. It is time to think differently, to be more innovative, creative and more efficient in the transit services we provide and the alternatives we present to our local boards, States, Federal Government and Congress.

CORRECTION TO THE RECORD OF FEBRUARY 26, 1997, PAGE H641

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND TAX REINSTATEMENT ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 668.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 668, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 347, nays 73, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—347

Abercrombie	Christensen	Frank (MA)
Ackerman	Clayton	Franks (NJ)
Allen	Clement	Frelinghuysen
Archer	Clyburn	Frost
Army	Coble	Furse
Bachus	Collins	Gallegly
Baesler	Combest	Ganske
Baker	Conyers	Gejdenson
Baldacci	Cook	Gekas
Ballenger	Costello	Gephardt
Barcia	Coyne	Gilchrest
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Gillmor
Barrett (WI)	Crane	Gonzalez
Bartlett	Cummings	Goode
Barton	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bass	Davis (FL)	Goodling
Bateman	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Becerra	Davis (VA)	Goss
Bentsen	DeFazio	Granger
Bereuter	DeGette	Green
Berman	Delahunt	Greenwood
Berry	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Bilbray	DeLay	Gutknecht
Bilirakis	Dellums	Hall (OH)
Bishop	Deutsch	Hamilton
Blagojevich	Diaz-Balart	Hansen
Bliley	Dicks	Harman
Blumenauer	Dixon	Hastert
Blunt	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Boehlert	Dooley	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	Doyle	Hayworth
Bonilla	Duncan	Hefner
Bonior	Dunn	Herger
Bono	Edwards	Hinchey
Borski	Ehlers	Hinojosa
Boswell	Ehrlich	Hobson
Boucher	Emerson	Holden
Boyd	English	Hooley
Brady	Ensign	Horn
Brown (CA)	Eshoo	Houghton
Brown (FL)	Etheridge	Hoyer
Brown (OH)	Evans	Hulshof
Bryant	Everett	Hutchinson
Bunning	Ewing	Hyde
Burr	Farr	Inglis
Buyer	Fattah	Istook
Callahan	Fawell	Jackson (IL)
Calvert	Fazio	Jackson-Lee
Camp	Filner	(TX)
Campbell	Flake	Jefferson
Canady	Foglietta	Jenkins
Capps	Foley	John
Cardin	Ford	Johnson (CT)
Castle	Fowler	Johnson (WI)
Chambliss	Fox	Johnson, E. B.

Johnson, Sam	Miller (FL)	Serrano
Kanjorski	Minge	Sessions
Kelly	Mink	Shaw
Kennedy (MA)	Moakley	Shays
Kennedy (RI)	Molinari	Sherman
Kennelly	Mollohan	Shuster
Kildee	Moran (KS)	Sisisky
Kilpatrick	Moran (VA)	Skaggs
Kim	Morella	Skeen
Kind (WI)	Murtha	Skelton
King (NY)	Nadler	Slaughter
Kleccka	Neal	Smith (NJ)
Klink	Nethercutt	Smith (TX)
Knollenberg	Ney	Smith, Adam
Kolbe	Northup	Smith, Linda
LaFalce	Nussle	Snyder
LaHood	Oberstar	Solomon
Lampson	Obey	Spence
Latham	Olver	Spratt
LaTourette	Ortiz	Stabenow
Lazio	Owens	Stark
Leach	Oxley	Stenholm
Levin	Packard	Stokes
Lewis (CA)	Pallone	Strickland
Lewis (GA)	Pascrell	Stupak
Lewis (KY)	Pastor	Sununu
Linder	Paxon	Tanner
Lipinski	Payne	Tauscher
Livingston	Pease	Thomas
LoBiondo	Pelosi	Thompson
Lofgren	Peterson (MN)	Thune
Lowe	Peterson (PA)	Thurman
Lucas	Petri	Tierney
Luther	Pickett	Torres
Maloney (NY)	Pitts	Towns
Manton	Pomeroy	Trafigant
Manzullo	Porter	Turner
Markey	Portman	Velázquez
Martinez	Poshard	Vento
Mascara	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Matsui	Pryce (OH)	Walsh
McCarthy (MO)	Quinn	Wamp
McCarthy (NY)	Radanovich	Waters
McCollum	Rahall	Watkins
McCrery	Ramstad	Watt (NC)
McDade	Rangel	Watts (OK)
McDermott	Regula	Waxman
McGovern	Riggs	Weldon (FL)
McHale	Rivers	Weldon (PA)
McHugh	Rogers	Weller
McInnis	Ros-Lehtinen	Wexler
McIntyre	Rothman	Weygand
McKeon	Roukema	White
McKinney	Roybal-Allard	Whitfield
McNulty	Rush	Wicker
Meehan	Sabo	Wise
Meek	Sanders	Wolf
Menendez	Sandlin	Woolsey
Metcalf	Sawyer	Wynn
Millender-	Saxton	Yates
McDonald	Schumer	
Miller (CA)	Scott	

NAYS—73

Aderholt	Hostettler	Salmon
Andrews	Hunter	Sanchez
Barr	Jones	Sanford
Burton	Kasich	Scarborough
Cannon	Kingston	Schaefer, Dan
Chabot	Klug	Schaefer, Bob
Chenoweth	Kucinich	Schiff
Coburn	Largent	Sensenbrenner
Condit	Maloney (CT)	Shadegg
Cooksey	McIntosh	Shimkus
Crapo	Mica	Snowbarger
Cubin	Myrick	Souder
Deal	Neumann	Stearns
Dickey	Norwood	Stump
Dreier	Pappas	Talent
Forbes	Parker	Tauzin
Gibbons	Paul	Taylor (MS)
Gilman	Pickering	Taylor (NC)
Graham	Pombo	Thornberry
Hall (TX)	Riley	Tiahrt
Hefley	Roemer	Upton
Hill	Rogan	Young (AK)
Hilleary	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
Hilliard	Royce	
Hoekstra	Ryun	

NOT VOTING—12

Carson	Dingell	Lantos
Clay	Doolittle	Reyes
Cox	Engel	Smith (MI)
Danner	Kaptur	Smith (OR)

□ 1251

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Danner and Mr. Reyes for, with Mr. Smith of Michigan against.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OMISSION FROM THE RECORD OF FEBRUARY 26, 1997, PAGE H643

SOUTH DAKOTANS AND THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the floor this morning by talking a little bit about my recent trip to South Dakota, and over the course of the President's recess I had the opportunity to spend 9 days in my home State, much of which was spent traveling around the State and listening to the people of our State talk about the issues that are important to them. One of the things that I attempted very much to discuss during the course of my travels was the upcoming vote on the balanced budget amendment.

Now, it is interesting to note that already the radio ads are running in my State attacking me for supporting a balanced budget amendment and, again, trying to scare South Dakota seniors against this important issue and trying to generate opposition that is based upon a divide and conquer type of strategy and approach, and it is interesting as I was traveling around the State, and I would stop in cafes across South Dakota and raise this issue, and people, as they listened to the radio ads, would have questions about how in fact this would affect important programs like Social Security. It was always amazing to me, as I explained to them that the balanced budget amendment as it is drafted can be overridden by a three-fifths vote of the Congress, and now takes 60 votes in the Senate to do anything, that 60 votes could override this amendment, and 290 votes in the House, and when I explained to them that in fact a balanced budget amendment would not in any way depart from the current budgetary agreement of Social Security; in other words, the fact that Social Security trust fund surplus is already being applied to hide the deficit, they would be surprised; and I went on further to explain that in this country each year we spend \$148 billion to pay the interest on the amount of money that we borrowed.

When they heard the facts, they were like: "I didn't realize that," and, "This really is important. This is something that we should do."

Now I have not been in Washington for all that long, but it is clear to me from the time that I have been here in Washington; you know, we are falling all over ourselves these days, patting

each other on the back over getting the deficit down, and frankly the deficit has been coming down as the economy has been performing well, but still, a \$126 billion deficit this year is \$126 billion that goes on to the \$6.6 or \$5.4 trillion debt, and in fact, even if the President's budget is adopted, which I question that it will be, and even if his economic assumptions are accurate, the debt at the end of the 5-year period in the year 2002 is \$2.6 trillion.

Now that is \$26,000 for every man, woman, and child in America, and furthermore, a kid born in America today will spend \$200,000 over the course of their lifetime just to pay the interest on the money that we have borrowed. And when you put that in that context, you realize that this vote is really a vote about the future of this country and what we are doing to the next generation of Americans, and I believe profoundly that, as we debate this over the next couple of weeks, that this is the most important vote that we will make for the future of America, and I would like to think that this body, the Congress, could make those decisions, but frankly, it has proven over the years that it cannot. In fact, the President's budget, what is supposed to balance the budget by the year 2002, in fact puts 73 percent of the savings after he leaves office.

We have proven that we do not have the political courage to make the decisions to get out country on a sound fiscal track, and so I would ask the Democrats and the Republicans, people from both sides of the aisle—I know many of the Democrats who ran in this last election year, and many of my Republican colleagues, as well as freshmen, ran on support of a balanced budget amendment, and it is too important to the future of this country.

I have a strong commitment to Social Security; most of the Members of this body do; and I will not do anything in my support for a balanced budget amendment that does in any way diminish that strong support. But this is not about Social Security. It is about the future of this country. And if we do not do something, we not only will not have any money for Social Security, but for every other program that we have in America today.

And so this is a vote for our kids, this is a vote for our families, this is a vote for the future, and as the debate begins in the next few weeks, and I would certainly hope that the Senate will have the votes next week to pass a balanced budget amendment, and if they do and it comes over to the House, that we will work together as Republicans and Democrats, because this is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue, this is an American issue, and it is critical to the future of this country that we do the right thing for our kids.

And so, Mr. Speaker, despite all the ads that may be running out there, I hope that in this vote that we will take in the next few weeks that this body will serve our country well and serve